

**Florida Tile Company, Division of Sikes Corporation
and United Steelworkers of America, AFL-
CIO-CLC. Case 9-CA-13773**

March 27, 1981

DECISION AND ORDER

On September 5, 1980, Administrative Law Judge George Norman issued the attached Decision in this proceeding. Thereafter, Respondent filed exceptions and a supporting brief,¹ and the General Counsel filed a brief in answer to Respondent's exceptions.

The Board has considered the record and the attached Decision in light of the exceptions and briefs and has decided to affirm the rulings, findings, and conclusions of the Administrative Law Judge and to adopt his recommended Order, as modified herein.

ORDER

Pursuant to Section 10(c) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, the National Labor Relations Board adopts as its Order the recommended Order of the Administrative Law Judge, as modified below, and hereby orders that the Respondent, Florida Tile Company, Division of Sikes Corporation, Lawrenceburg, Kentucky, its officers, agents, successors, and assigns, shall take the action set forth in the said recommended Order, as so modified:

Substitute the following for paragraph 2(d):

"(d) Post at its office and place of business in Lawrenceburg, Kentucky, copies of the attached notice marked 'Appendix.'¹² Copies of said notice, on forms provided by the Regional Director for Region 9, after being duly signed by Respondent's authorized representative, shall be posted by Respondent immediately upon receipt thereof, and be maintained by it for 60 consecutive days thereafter, in conspicuous places, including all places where notices to employees are customarily posted. Reasonable steps shall be taken by Respondent to insure that said notices are not altered, defaced, or covered by any other material."

¹ Respondent's request for oral argument is hereby denied inasmuch as the record, exceptions, and briefs adequately present the issues and the positions of the parties.

DECISION

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

GEORGE NORMAN, Administrative Law Judge: The hearing in this case was held in Lawrenceburg, Kentucky, on January 10 and 30 and February 13, 1980. The complaint, which was issued on June 12, 1979, by the Regional Director for Region 9 of the National Labor

Relations Board is based on a charge filed by United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO-CLC (herein the Union), on April 23, 1979, alleging that Respondent violated Section 8(a)(1) and (3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended (herein the Act), by issuing two written reprimands to employee Connie Beavers and thereafter discharging her.

Respondent denied the substantive allegations of the complaint.

All parties were given full opportunity to participate, introduce relevant evidence, to examine and cross-examine witnesses, and to argue orally. The General Counsel and Respondent filed briefs.

Upon the entire record including my consideration of the briefs and careful observation of the witnesses and their demeanor, I make the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT

I. THE BUSINESS OF RESPONDENT

Respondent Florida Tile Company, Division of Sikes Corporation, is engaged in the manufacture and distribution of tile at its Lawrenceburg, Kentucky, facility. During the past 12 months, a representative period, Respondent sold and shipped goods and materials, valued in excess of \$50,000, from its Lawrenceburg, Kentucky, facility directly to points outside the State of Kentucky. Respondent is an employer within the meaning of Section 2(2) of the Act, engaged in commerce and an operation affecting commerce within the meaning of Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act.

II. THE LABOR ORGANIZATION INVOLVED

United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO-CLC, is a labor organization within the meaning of Section 2(5) of the Act.

III. THE ALLEGED UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

Connie Beavers started working for Respondent at its Lawrenceburg, Kentucky, plant on November 12, 1977, and was terminated on March 23, 1979.¹ She was employed as a sorter of tiles along with certain other employees who were in the same job classification. She started getting involved in the union organizational drive at Respondent's plant in January. She attended her first meeting in January where she received union buttons and pamphlets. She wore her union button on her shoulder at work and succeeded in getting several fellow employees to sign union authorization cards while at work.

On Monday, March 19, about 4:30 a.m. (end of the third shift, 6 p.m. to 4:30 a.m.) Connie Beavers and a fellow worker, Nancy Caudill, were in the women's locker room after work, attempting to get other employees who also just finished work to sign union authorization cards.² As Nancy Caudill assisted Vickie Darnell in filling out a union authorization card, Connie Beavers

¹ All events herein occurred in 1979 unless otherwise indicated.

² Pat Humphrey testified that she had not heard of anyone except Connie Beavers and Nancy Caudill trying to get people to sign union authorization cards.

approached employee Pat Humphrey and asked her to sign an authorization card. Pat Humphrey's version of the event is as follows:

Well, I had just finished my shift and I was going into the locker room and Connie Beavers and Nancy Caudill were in the locker room. And when I walked in she asked me if I would like to sign a Union card, and I said, "No way." And she said, "Oh, come on. If you do, everybody else will." And I said, "I don't know." And she said, "Come on Pat." And I said, "Well, let me see it." So Nancy Caudill handed me a Union card. And I was looking at it and I knelt down by the locker and I had an ink pen and the card in my hand and I started to sign it.

And I was thinking to myself that I didn't want to sign it and I kept telling Connie that I didn't want to sign it. And about that time Joan Newton walked out of the girls' restroom and she said, "Pat, what are you doing." I said, "I don't know for sure what I am doing yet." I said, "Connie wants me to sign this Union card."

And she said, "Well I am not telling you what to do but if I was you, I wouldn't." And I said, "I don't really want to." And then about that time, Connie jumps up and she says, "Pat, do you tell Joan who to—who to fuck, who, when, where, and how." And Joan said, "Pat don't tell me what to do." And Connie says, "Okay, then don't let Joan tell you what to do." And I said, "Joan don't tell me what to do." And she said, "Well she just fucking did. She tried to tell you not to sign this Union card."

And then I said, "Connie, I didn't want to sign this card before." And lets see—what else was there? She said something about, don't let Joan run your life. And I said, "Joan doesn't run my life." And I said, "I can run my own life." I said, "Didn't I tell you my husband didn't want me to sign a Union card, because he was in a Union where he worked. And he said all it was good for was to take your money, and he didn't want me to sign it." And then she asked me if my brother had a union where he was working and did he complain about it. And I said, "Well, I don't know, I never heard him say anything about it."

And then she kept asking me to sign a card and I kept telling her no, I didn't think I wanted to.

And we got up and was fixing to leave the locker room, and she kept telling me to go ahead and let Joan run my fucking life. And I said, "Joan don't run my life, I'm old enough to run my own." And Joan says, "oh, come on." And as we walked out the door she said, those dumb bitches—or damn bitches, something about bitches when we walked out of the locker room.³

³ The above is a direct quote from the transcript by the Acme Reporting Company, including punctuation or lack thereof.

Nancy Caudill testified that Joan Newton came out of the bathroom "and she shook her head or said something to the effect, you better not, or, I wouldn't do that." Newton addressed her remark to Pat Humphrey. She said that Pat Humphrey replied, "Well, I think maybe I'd better think about it a while." Connie then said, "Don't you have a mind of your own? Does Joan tell you what to do? And Pat said 'Nobody tells me what the hell to do.' And Connie said 'Well, she just fucking well did.'"

Caudill testified further that words went back and forth between the three and, as Humphrey and Newton were leaving, "Connie was still saying something Joan and Pat—as Joan and Pat were going out the door, Connie was still saying something. I don't remember what. And Joannie, as she was going out the door, says, 'Oh, Connie, shut your fucking mouth,' in that tone of voice. Connie replied, 'If you think you can, come back and make me.'"⁴

Connie Beavers, Joan Newton, and Pat Humphrey had good relations prior to that conversation in the locker room. In fact, Newton and Beavers were in a carpool together. Joan Newton and Pat Humphrey were scheduled to pick up Connie Beavers at Long John Silvers on the way to work and the three were to ride together at same day to report to work at 6 p.m. Monday. In that connection, Pat Humphrey testified that she and Joan Newton were supposed to give Connie Beavers ride to work that Monday night, March 19. When asked whether they did pick up Connie Beavers, Humphrey said, "No, when we got to where her car was parked she wasn't sitting in it and we didn't know whether she was waiting for us or whatever, and we just went on and left her anyway."⁵ Connie Beavers testified that on the evening of March 19 she went to Long John Silvers to wait to be picked up by Cathy, Joan Newton, and Pat Humphrey. She sat there from 4:35 to 4:55 and, when no one showed up, she left and drove to work by herself. Concerning the conversation of the morning of March 19, Pat Humphrey testified that that was the first time she had ever heard anyone cuss somebody like that (referring to Connie Beavers' statements to her). However, on cross-examination Humphrey admitted that she had called fellow employee Linda Hahn a whore in the parking lot of the Company, and that she and Hahn were on the ground of the parking lot "slugging it out." "She called me something too. That's why I called her one." She was asked if that's when she accused Hahn of "shacking up" and Humphrey replied in the affirmative, adding that it was true. She said that, at the time, she told the Company what had happened. Both employees received warning slips for that incident.

⁴ Caudill's version was corroborated by Beavers, and Humphrey's version was corroborated by Newton. According to the testimony of those witnesses and others, the language of the type used above was not uncommon in the plant among both employees and supervisors. It appears that all three parties to that conversation used four letter words not only then but probably quite frequently in the plant. I believe Caudill's version as to what Joan Newton said to Beavers as she was leaving the plant.

⁵ In view of that testimony the conclusion is inescapable that Humphrey and Newton could not have been too upset with Beavers' remarks to them on the morning of the same day inasmuch as they were prepared to pick her up.

Beavers' Remarks to Charlie Smith

Beavers said that on the evening of March 19, Humphrey and Newton were working across the room from her and that it was not possible for anyone speaking in a normal tone to be heard from that distance. She said that Valerie Brock and she were talking to employee Charlie Smith who after speaking with them for a while would go over and speak to Joan Newton and Pat Humphrey and then return and speak to them. He was going back and forth. About 10 p.m. she was approached by the leadlady, Betty Belt, and was told that Supervisor Steve Mitchell wanted to see her upstairs. When she arrived upstairs, Supervisors Steve Mitchell and Lois Tensley were there. Mitchell said, "Connie, we're sending you home." Beavers said, "For what?" Mitchell responded, "Joan and Pat are very upset so we're sending you home until further investigated." Beavers replied, "Well, what am I supposed to do? How will I know when to come back to work?" Mitchell said, "You call in Thursday at 9:00 and ask to speak to Bill Auvil." Whereupon, the guard was summoned and he escorted her out of the plant.

Thursday morning at 9 o'clock, Beavers called Bill Auvil, personnel manager as she was instructed. Auvil told her to call back Friday at 12; that they were still investigating. On Friday, the 23d, about 11:30 a.m., Production Manager Bobby McFarland phoned and asked her to appear at the plant; they wanted to hear her side of the story. Beavers arrived at the plant about 2:30 that afternoon and was directed to McFarland's office. Present were McFarland and Steve Mitchell. McFarland said, "Connie we're ready to hear your side of the story now." Beavers told her side of the story and when she finished McFarland said, "Is that all you have to say?" She replied, "Yes sir, that's the way that I remembered it." McFarland asked Mitchell if he had any questions. Mitchell replied that he had none. McFarland then opened his desk drawer, removed two yellow slips and placed them on the table. When Beavers asked what they were, McFarland told her that one was for her harassing and badgering an employee and the other for vicious and malicious false statements about a fellow employee. Beavers said, "Well, you've already had your mind made up to fire me before you even heard my side of the story." McFarland responded that he wanted to give her a fair chance. Beavers said, "You call it fair when you've already got your yellow slips made up? You haven't even heard the first word from me." McFarland replied, "Well, we went over the case real well and we both decided that you deserve a yellow slip for each incident."

Concerning the latter incident, Charlie Smith testified that on the evening in question he was in conversation with Connie Beavers and that Connie was telling him and Valerie Brock about employee Paul Satterly and Pat Humphrey. She said that they had a date at 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning after work and that he tried to have sex with her and she refused him. Smith said that Connie also said, "What else would you expect if someone asked you out at 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning. What else do you expect? You know that's what they want to do." He said that Beavers was talking about the

people who go tell about the Union and "stuff like that that ought to have their butt kicked." He said that Beavers also told him that she "wouldn't touch Pat Humphrey with a 10-foot pole because she was scared she might have VD."

Pat Humphrey testified that she learned of the conversation between Beavers and Smith from Joan Newton. Newton told her that Connie Beavers told Charlie Smith that she, Pat Humphrey, was "playing up to Paul Satterly and that when I went out with him I wouldn't even let him kiss me. And she just, you know, was talking about me and everything. So I went up and told Steve Mitchell about it." Humphrey further testified that while she was sitting in Mitchell's office, Mitchell called Charlie Smith to the office and he told Mitchell what Beavers had said.⁶ Bob McFarland testified that the incidents were reported to him and he instructed the plant manager to make an investigation. He said that following the investigation he asked that two separate written warnings be drawn up for Beavers. He said that they were written up and he put them in his desk drawer. He stated further that when he spoke to Connie Beavers he told her that if she could bring him proof or witnesses that pointed out that she did not do what she was accused of, the written warnings would be torn up, but that she had nothing to say about that. When McFarland was asked whether Pat Humphrey or Joan Newton were given written warnings he replied in the negative and stated that he had no facts showing that they were at fault.⁷

Supervisor Steve Mitchell testified that on the Friday that Connie Beavers was fired, Bob McFarland, Jim Jeffries, Bill Auvil, and he discussed whether to issue one written warning or two. He said that the decision was to issue two written warning slips. When asked who suggested that the two warnings be given, Mitchell said, "Bob McFarland."⁸

⁶ Pat Humphrey admitted that she did in fact go out with Paul Satterly but that she was separated from her husband at that time.

⁷ With respect to the first incident, McFarland did admit that Nancy Caudill did report to him that Joan Newton used the foul language referred to above.

⁸ Connie Beavers was terminated on March 23 for receiving three yellow written warnings within 12 months as per Respondent's policy requiring the automatic termination of any and all employees receiving three written warnings in 12 months. Beavers received her first warning slip for excessive absenteeism on January 31. Her second warning slip for harassing and badgering a fellow employee on March 19 and her third and final warning slip for making false and malicious statements about a fellow employee also on March 19. Beavers admits her first warning slip was not because of her union activity. It is especially noted that the first conversation of March 19 took place after working hours in a nonworking area and the second conversation occurred at the beginning of the shift at 6 p.m. on the same day, March 19. Respondent's contention that they occurred on March 18 and 19 is rejected. Even though the confrontation occurred at the end of the shift and the second episode occurred during the next working period on the same day, I consider the second matter a continuation of the first and not two separate infractions calling for two separate written warnings regardless of the merits of Respondent's action. I am convinced that Respondent was bent on discharging Beavers and the decision to issue two warnings for what was essentially one event was based on providing three reprimands within a 12-month period, thus making her discharge automatic.

Discussion and Conclusions

This is a case involving a typical union organizational drive in which some of the more active employees attempted to get their fellow employees to sign union authorization cards and while so doing they may have violated a company rule and were discharged ostensibly for such violation. The question to be resolved here is whether Respondent reprimanded and discharged employee Connie Beavers violating company rules (receiving three written reprimands or written warnings within a 12-month period) without regard to her union activity or whether she was discharged because of her union activity.

The fact that employees Connie Beavers and Nancy Caudill had been engaged in union activity is undisputed.⁹ Likewise, the fact that Connie Beavers used profanity in her conversation of the morning of March 19 is not in dispute. However, many other employees including Joan Newton and Pat Humphrey used profanity in their conversations in the plant both while on duty and off duty. Indeed, Joan Newton's profanity matched that of Beavers in their March 19 early morning conversation leading to the reprimand and discharge of Beavers. Joan Newton was an instigator who interfered with Connie Beavers while she was trying to get fellow employee Pat Humphrey to sign a union authorization card in a non-working area and on nonworking time. Neither Newton nor Humphrey received written warnings for their behavior on the morning of March 19 although Newton's language was as profane as Beavers'.

Pat Humphrey's (admission by Humphrey) fight with employee Linda Hahn in the parking lot of the company at which time Humphrey called Hahn a "whore" and accused her of "shacking up" was certainly a more serious confrontation ("slugging it out") than that which occurred in the locker room on the morning of March 19. Yet Respondent, in that situation, gave warning slips to both employees rather than singling out one as it did in the case of Beavers. I suspect the apparent equal treatment by Respondent in that case resulted from the absence of union activity as a factor.

Respondent exaggerated the effect of the March 19 morning conversation on Humphrey and Newton by claiming that they were very upset. Just a few hours after that episode Humphrey and Newton were about to give Beavers a ride to work but continued on without her when they did not see her at the appointed place and time. Newton and Humphrey could not have been very upset if according to Humphrey they were prepared to give Beavers a ride as previously scheduled if she had been there. I conclude that Beavers, Humphrey, and Newton, who had been fairly close associates, were accustomed to using profanity in their everyday communications. Respondent was aware of the widespread use of profanity among its employees as a common everyday occurrence. Respondent's own exhibits demonstrated its awareness. The exhibits consisted for the most part of written warnings to several employees for using profanity in the shop. However the issue is not whether or not

Respondent condoned profanity among its employees but whether it discriminated against a particular employee who used profanity by punishing that employee to the exclusion of others using profanity in the same incident because that employee was soliciting union authorization cards at that time. I do not consider that Beavers' conduct on the morning of March 19 could be characterized as "harassing and badgering another employee to do something against her will"; the facts simply do not support that characterization. It is evident that Connie Beavers was singled out and treated discriminatorily, *vis-a-vis* Newton and Humphrey. Respondent seized upon the alleged profanity used by her as a pretext to cover the real reason for the discharge of Beavers; namely, her support for and activities on behalf of the Union. *Shattuck Denn Mining Corporation (Iron King Branch)*, 151 NLRB 1328 (1965), *enfd.* 362 F.2d 466 (9th Cir. 1966).

As for the warning Beavers was issued on the evening of March 19 "for making vicious and malicious statements" about a fellow employee, the facts do not support that charge either. Although Connie Beavers' discussion with employee Charlie Smith concerning the behavior of Pat Humphrey and Paul Satterly is neither proper nor acceptable, the statements were not untrue¹⁰ and appeared to be of the type that everyone at some time or other is subjected to because of sometimes unavoidable social business contacts. Reputations, good or bad, are formed on the basis of such discussions conducted out of the presence of the subject. Such talk is especially vicious and malicious when it is false. Moreover, the conversation between Beavers and Smith out of hearing range of Newton and Humphrey did not, nor was it intended to, reach the ears of either. It was Newton's troublemaking tendencies or "instigating propensities" that caused Charlie Smith to reveal what Beavers had said, to Newton and later to Humphrey and Supervisor Mitchell. Again, nothing would have come of the incident if Newton had not interfered.

As for Respondent, it appears that it seized upon this second and otherwise personal matter to come up with the needed "two more warnings" to make a total of three to justify, under its own rules, the automatic discharge of Beavers. The fact that Respondent discussed whether to issue one or two warnings among its supervisors reveals that even Respondent considered the Beavers-Smith conversation of the evening of March 19 but a continuation of the 4:30 a.m. March 19 incident. One warning would have been more appropriate but only one warning would not have given Respondent the required three warnings to effect an immediate discharge. Thus, the decision to issue two provided the vehicle for the instant discharge of Beavers.

I find that Respondent's entire conduct in this matter was illegally motivated. The warnings and discharge of Connie Beavers were because of her union activity and not for the reasons given by Respondent, which I find to be pretextual.

⁹ As previously indicated, Pat Humphrey did not know of any employees besides Beavers and Caudill who engaged in union activity.

¹⁰ Pat Humphrey admitted dating Paul Satterly on the occasion in question.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Florida Tile Company, Division of Sikes Corporation, is an employer within the meaning of Section 2(2) of the Act, engaged in commerce within the meaning of Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act.

2. United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO-CLC, is a labor organization within the meaning of Section 2(5) of the Act.

3. Respondent issued written reprimands to employee Connie Beavers because of her sympathy for, membership in, or activities on behalf of the Union.

4. Respondent discharged employee Connie Beavers because of her sympathy for, membership in, or activities on behalf of the Union.

5. Respondent discriminated in regard to hire and tenure of employment of its employees by said reprimands and discharge and engaged in and is engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of Section 8(a)(1) and (3) of the Act.

6. Respondent interfered with, restrained, and coerced, and is interfering with, restraining, and coercing its employees in the exercise of rights guaranteed in Section 7 of the Act.

THE REMEDY

Having found that Respondent has committed certain unfair labor practices it will be recommended that Respondent be ordered to cease and desist therefrom and take certain affirmative actions necessary to effectuate the purposes of the Act.

I have found that Respondent reprimanded and discharged Connie Beavers in violation of the provisions of Section 8(a)(3) and (1) of the Act. I shall therefore recommend that Respondent make Connie Beavers whole for any loss of pay for which she has suffered as a result of the discrimination practiced upon her. The backpay provided herein with interest thereon is to be computed in the manner prescribed in *F. W. Woolworth Company*, 90 NLRB 289 (1950), and *Florida Steel Corporation*, 231 NLRB 651 (1977). I shall also recommend that Respondent expunge from its personnel records all references to the two written reprimands issued to employee Connie Beavers on or about March 23, 1979.

Upon the basis of the foregoing findings of fact, conclusions of law, upon the entire record in this proceeding, and pursuant to Section 10(c) of the Act, I hereby issue the following recommended:

ORDER¹¹

Respondent, Florida Tile Company, Division of Sikes Corporation, Lawrenceburg, Kentucky, its officers, agents, successors, and assigns, shall:

1. Cease and desist from:

(a) Issuing written reprimands to its employees because of said employees' membership in, sympathy for, and/or activities on behalf of the Union.

(b) Discharging its employees and failing and refusing to reinstate them to their former positions of employment because of said employees' membership in, sympathy for, or activities on behalf of the Union.

(c) In any like or related manner interfering with, restraining, or coercing employees in the exercise of rights guaranteed in Section 7 of the Act.

2. Take the following affirmative action necessary to effectuate the policies of the Act:

(a) Offer Connie Beavers immediate and full reinstatement to her former position or, if such position no longer exists, to a substantially equivalent position, without prejudice to her seniority or other rights and privileges, and make her whole for any loss of earnings suffered by her as a result of her discharge, in the manner set forth in the section herein entitled "The Remedy."

(b) Expunge from the personnel records of Connie Beavers the written reprimands issued to her on or about March 23, 1979.

(c) Preserve and, upon request, make available to the Board or its agents all records necessary to analyze the amount of backpay due under the terms herein.

(d) Post at its office and place of business at Lawrenceburg, Kentucky, copies of the attached notice marked "Appendix."¹² Copies of said notice on forms provided by the Regional Director for Region 9, after being duly signed by Respondent's authorized representatives, shall be maintained for 60 consecutive days thereafter, in conspicuous places, including all places where notices to employees are customarily posted. Respondent shall take reasonable steps to insure that said notices are not altered, defaced, or covered by any other material.

(e) Notify the Regional Director for Region 9, in writing, within 20 days of this Order, what steps Respondent has taken to comply herewith.

¹² In the event the Board's Order is enforced by a Judgment of a United States Court of Appeals, the words in the notice reading "Posted by Order of the National Labor Relations Board" shall read "Posted Pursuant to a Judgment of the United States Court of Appeals Enforcing an Order of the National Labor Relations Board."

APPENDIX

NOTICE TO EMPLOYEES

POSTED BY ORDER OF THE

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

An Agency of the United States Government

WE WILL NOT issue written reprimands to our employees because of their membership in, sympathy for, or activities on behalf of the Union.

WE WILL NOT discharge our employees and thereafter refuse to reinstate them to their former positions of employment because of their membership in, sympathy for, and/or activities on behalf of the Union.

WE WILL NOT in any like or related manner interfere with, restrain, or coerce our employees in

¹¹ In the event no exceptions are filed as provided by Sec. 102.46 of the Rules and Regulations of the National Labor Relations Board, the findings, conclusions, and recommended Order herein shall, as provided in Sec. 102.48 of the Rules and Regulations, be adopted by the Board and become its findings, conclusions, and Order, and all objections thereto shall be deemed waived for all purposes.

the exercise of their rights to self-organization, to form, join, or assist United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO, or any labor organization, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection, or to refrain from any or all such activities.

WE WILL offer Connie Beavers immediate and full reinstatement to her former position or, if such position no longer exists, to substantially equivalent

position, without prejudice to her seniority or other rights and privileges, and make her whole for any loss of earnings suffered by her plus interest as a result of her termination.

WE WILL expunge from our personnel records all references to the two reprimands issued to Connie Beavers on or about March 23, 1979.

FLORIDA TILE COMPANY, DIVISION OF
SIKES CORPORATION